

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA



FORMS FOR FILING CASES *PRO SE* (Representing Yourself) Non-Prisoner

Revised October 5, 2020

Lance Lewis filing. Please reference
attached right-to-sue letter and
attached 11 page document. 22 10.18.21

About These Forms

1. **In General.** This and the other pleading forms available from the www.uscourts.gov website illustrate some types of information that are useful to have in complaints and some other pleadings. The forms do not try to cover every type of case. They are limited to types of cases often filed in federal courts by those who represent themselves or who may not have much experience in federal courts.
2. **Not Legal Advice.** No form provides legal advice. No form substitutes for having or consulting a lawyer. If you are not a lawyer and are suing or have been sued, it is best to have or consult a lawyer if possible.
3. **No Guarantee.** Following a form does not guarantee that any pleading is legally or factually correct or sufficient.
4. **Variations Possible.** A form may call for more or less information than a particular court requires. The fact that a form asks for certain information does not mean that every court or a particular court requires it. And if the form does not ask for certain information, a particular court might still require it. Consult the rules and caselaw that govern in the court where you are filing the pleading.
5. **Examples Only.** The forms do not try to address or cover all the different types of claims or defenses, or how specific facts might affect a particular claim or defense. Some of the forms, such as the form for a generic complaint, apply to different types of cases. Others apply only to specific types of cases. Be careful to use the form that fits your case and the type of pleading you want to file. Be careful to change the information the form asks for to fit the facts and circumstances of your case.
6. **No Guidance on Timing or Parties.** The forms do not give any guidance on when certain kinds of pleadings or claims or defenses have to be raised, or who has to be sued. Some pleadings, claims, or defenses have to be raised at a certain point in the case or within a certain period of time. And there are limits on who can be named as a party in a case and when they have to be added. Lawyers and people representing themselves must know the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and the caselaw setting out these and other requirements. The current Federal Rules of Civil Procedure are available, for free, at www.uscourts.gov.
7. **Privacy Requirements.** Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 5.2 addresses the privacy and security concerns over public access to electronic court files. Under this rule, papers filed with the court should not contain anyone's full social-security number or full birth date; the name of a person known to be a minor; or a complete financial-account number. A filing may include only the last four digits of a social-security number and taxpayer identification number; the year of someone's birth; a minor's initials; and the last four digits of a financial-account number.

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Lance Howell Lewis

(Write the full name of each plaintiff who is filing this complaint. If the names of all the plaintiffs cannot fit in the space above, please write "see attached" in the space and attach an additional page with the full list of names.)

-against-

Boeing

(Write the full name of each defendant who is being sued. If the names of all the defendants cannot fit in the space above, please write "see attached" in the space and attach an additional page with the full list of names.)

Complaint for a Civil Case

Case No. 2:21-CV-03398-RMG-MHB

(to be filled in by the Clerk's Office)

Jury Trial: Yes No
(check one)

USDC RECEIVED
CLERK, CHARLESTON, SC
2021 OCT 18 AM 11:48

I. The Parties to This Complaint

A. The Plaintiff(s)

Provide the information below for each plaintiff named in the complaint. Attach additional pages if needed.

Name	<u>Lance Lewis</u>
Street Address	<u>2181 Dunlap St., Apt. A-C</u>
City and County	<u>Charleston</u>
State and Zip Code	<u>SC 29406</u>
Telephone Number	

B. The Defendant(s)

Provide the information below for each defendant named in the complaint, whether the defendant is an individual, a government agency, an organization, or a corporation. For an individual defendant, include the person's job or title (if known). Attach additional pages if needed.

Defendant No. 1

Name	<u>Boeing</u>
Job or Title (if known)	<u>Commercial Aircraft</u>
Street Address	
City and County	<u>Charleston</u>
State and Zip Code	<u>SC 29418</u>
Telephone Number	

Defendant No. 2

Name	
Job or Title (if known)	
Street Address	
City and County	
State and Zip Code	
Telephone Number	

Defendant No. 3

Name	
------	--

Job or Title (if known)	_____
Street Address	_____
City and County	_____
State and Zip Code	_____
Telephone Number	_____
Defendant No. 4	
Name	_____
Job or Title (if known)	_____
Street Address	_____
City and County	_____
State and Zip Code	_____
Telephone Number	_____

II. Basis for Jurisdiction

Federal courts are courts of limited jurisdiction (limited power). Generally, only two types of cases can be heard in federal court: cases involving a federal question and cases involving diversity of citizenship of the parties. Under 28 U.S.C. § 1331, a case arising under the United States Constitution or federal laws or treaties is a federal question case. Under 28 U.S.C. § 1332, a case in which a citizen of one State sues a citizen of another State or nation and the amount at stake is more than \$75,000 is a diversity of citizenship case. In a diversity of citizenship case, no defendant may be a citizen of the same State as any plaintiff.

What is the basis for federal court jurisdiction? (check all that apply)

Federal question

Diversity of citizenship

Fill out the paragraphs in this section that apply to this case.

A. If the Basis for Jurisdiction Is a Federal Question

List the specific federal statutes, federal treaties, and/or provisions of the United States Constitution that are at issue in this case.

Title VII Age Discrimination /
Retaliation in Employment Act

B. If the Basis for Jurisdiction Is Diversity of Citizenship

1. The Plaintiff(s)

a. If the plaintiff is an individual

The plaintiff, (name) Lance L. Lewis is a citizen of the State of (name) _____.

b. If the plaintiff is a corporation

The plaintiff, (name) _____, is incorporated under the laws of the State of (name) _____, and has its principal place of business in the State of (name) _____.

(If more than one plaintiff is named in the complaint, attach an additional page providing the same information for each additional plaintiff.)

2. The Defendant(s)

a. If the defendant is an individual

The defendant, (name) _____, is a citizen of the State of (name) _____. Or is a citizen of (foreign nation) _____.

b. If the defendant is a corporation

The defendant, (name) Boeing, is incorporated under the laws of the State of (name) SC, and has its principal place of business in the State of (name) SC. Or is incorporated under the laws of (foreign nation) _____, and has its principal place of business in (name) _____.

(If more than one defendant is named in the complaint, attach an additional page providing the same information for each additional defendant.)

3. The Amount in Controversy

The amount in controversy—the amount the plaintiff claims the defendant owes or the amount at stake—is more than \$75,000, not counting interest and costs of court, because (*explain*):

R.F. EEOC charge No. A15-2021-01047.
Amount is undetermined.

III. Statement of Claim

Write a short and plain statement of the claim. Do not make legal arguments. State as briefly as possible the facts showing that each plaintiff is entitled to the damages or other relief sought. State how each defendant was involved and what each defendant did that caused the plaintiff harm or violated the plaintiff's rights, including the dates and places of that involvement or conduct. If more than one claim is asserted, number each claim and write a short and plain statement of each claim in a separate paragraph. Attach additional pages if needed.

Materially adverse retaliation action
of unpaid suspension time beginning
Sept. 2 until what ever date an
investigation is completed.

Reference attached document of 10-18-21

IV. Relief

State briefly and precisely what damages or other relief the plaintiff asks the court to order. Do not make legal arguments. Include any basis for claiming that the wrongs alleged are continuing at the present time. Include the amounts of any actual damages claimed for the acts alleged and the basis for these amounts. Include any punitive or exemplary damages claimed, the amounts, and the reasons you claim you are entitled to actual or punitive money damages.

Salary is \$24.65/hr. Work week is 40 hrs.
so 6 weeks or 240 hrs x \$24.65/hr.
plus the days of Sept. 2 and Sept. 3.

U.S. EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION

DISMISSAL AND NOTICE OF RIGHTS

To: Lance L. Lewis
2181 Dunlap St., Apt. 4C
Charleston, SC 29406

From: Savannah Local Office
7391 Hodgson Memorial Drive
Suite 200
Savannah, GA 31406



*On behalf of person(s) aggrieved whose identity is
CONFIDENTIAL (29 CFR §1601.7(a))*

EEOC Charge No.

EEOC Representative

Telephone No.

415-2021-01047

Jennifer L. Bessick,
Investigator

(912) 920-4488

THE EEOC IS CLOSING ITS FILE ON THIS CHARGE FOR THE FOLLOWING REASON:

- The facts alleged in the charge fail to state a claim under any of the statutes enforced by the EEOC.
- Your allegations did not involve a disability as defined by the Americans With Disabilities Act.
- The Respondent employs less than the required number of employees or is not otherwise covered by the statutes.
- Your charge was not timely filed with EEOC; in other words, you waited too long after the date(s) of the alleged discrimination to file your charge.
- The EEOC issues the following determination: The EEOC will not proceed further with its investigation, and makes no determination about whether further investigation would establish violations of the statute. This does not mean the claims have no merit. This determination does not certify that the respondent is in compliance with the statutes. The EEOC makes no finding as to the merits of any other issues that might be construed as having been raised by this charge.
- The EEOC has adopted the findings of the state or local fair employment practices agency that investigated this charge.
- Other (briefly state)

- NOTICE OF SUIT RIGHTS -

(See the additional information attached to this form.)

Title VII, the Americans with Disabilities Act, the Genetic Information Nondiscrimination Act, or the Age Discrimination in Employment Act: This will be the only notice of dismissal and of your right to sue that we will send you. You may file a lawsuit against the respondent(s) under federal law based on this charge in federal or state court. Your lawsuit must be filed WITHIN 90 DAYS of your receipt of this notice; or your right to sue based on this charge will be lost. (The time limit for filing suit based on a claim under state law may be different.)

Equal Pay Act (EPA): EPA suits must be filed in federal or state court within 2 years (3 years for willful violations) of the alleged EPA underpayment. This means that backpay due for any violations that occurred more than 2 years (3 years) before you file suit may not be collectible.

On behalf of the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission
Omayra Padilla
Padilla
Date: 2021.07.20 14:14:28 -04'00'

7/20/2021

Enclosures(s)

Omayra Padilla,
Director

(Date Issued)

cc:

David Wuerch
Global EEO Compliance Specialist
BOEING
3003 W. Casino Rd., Mailcode 074-02
Everett, WA 98204

TO: United States EEOC
Savannah Local Office
7391 Hodgson Memorial Drive
Suite 200
Savannah, GA 31406-2579

Charleston Federal
Courthouse
85 Broad Street
Charleston, SC

29401

FROM: Lance Lewis
2181 Dunlap Street, Apartment 4C
Charleston, SC 29406
(H) 843-574-4914 843-574-4914
(C) 843-729-1694 1914
E-Mail: Lancelewis@bellsouth.net

SUBJECT: Management Misconduct, Harassment, Discrimination, and Retaliation

DATE: October 18, 2021

OVERVIEW

I am lodging a new written formal EEOC ethics complaint on Boeing. Please know that this complaint is relative to EEOC 415-2021-01047. Today, 10-18-21 at 8:30 AM I filed a Federal Lawsuit in the Charleston Federal Courthouse at 85 Broad Street in Charleston, SC 29401.

BACKGROUND

I started working in Aerospace on February 10, 2012. I was a contractor with Moseley Technical Services from February 10, 2012 until September 20, 2012. On September 21, 2012, I became a Boeing Employee. My position is a Manufacturing Tech (MT) in Composite Fabrication. I work first shift. I have always been compliant and followed the Boeing Guidelines.

The address of the main Boeing Plant is at the following address:
5400 International Boulevard, North Charleston, SC 29418

This site has three main buildings. They are the following:

Bldg. 88-19 Composite Fab

Bldg. 88-20 Mid-Body

Bldg. 88-30 Final Assembly

I worked in Bldg. 88-19 until January 28, 2021. I was assigned to Composite Fab. This is one half of the building. The other side of this building is Assembly & Installation (A&I).

I accepted a MT position at Interiors Responsibility Center (IRC) and reported there on January 29, 2021. The location of Bldg. 88-50 IRC is at the following address:
9775 Patriot Boulevard, Ladson, SC 29456

P.2LLRPT10/18/21

EOC DOCUMENTS OF EEOC CHARGE 415-2021-01047

First: May 23, 2021 {The number of pages was 7}.
 Second: June 28, 2021 {The number of pages was 5}.

BOEING DOCUMENTS OF EEOC CHARGE 415-2021-01047

First: March 20, 2021 {Case 885117: The number of pages was 7}.
 Second: May 22, 2021 {Rebuttal Document: The number of pages was 8}.
 Third: June 10, 2021 {Case 89107: The number of pages was 6}.
 All involved Boeing Manager Cameron Lee. The Rebuttal Document of May 22, 2021 involved an alleged violation filed by Cameron Lee. I was advised of it on May 20, 2021.

NEW BOEING DOCUMENTS SINCE DISMISSAL AND NOTICE OF RIGHTS ON 7-20-21

First: July 31, 2021 {Case 894916: The number of pages was 6}. This document expressed more harassment and discrimination about Cameron Lee on the day of July 30. It also stated that he was no longer my manager but he accused me directly on the production floor that I was violating the production process. In the document itself, I explained the production process by the applicable BAC (Boeing Aircraft Company) Standard. I specifically cited this 32 page process with the applicable page and section numbers concerning the relative work done. I complied with the standard which the work was performed. In addition, after clocking out that day, I went to **Nelson Akwari** who is the IRC Building Operations for all managers and reported this incident. He listened intently. I could see the concern on his face. We met on Monday August 2 at 7:00 AM in the Honeysuckle Conference Room. I gave him a "Proprietary Report" of 1 page. This report at that time had the dates and case numbers for all previous "Boeing Documents" filed on Cameron Lee. The latest incident of July 30, 2021 with its filed date of July 31 was on it as well with "No Case Number Assigned Yet". He quickly read it and said all of this is **unacceptable**. In addition, I gave him a copy of the BAC Standard with another paper outlining the applicable page and section numbers as related to Cameron Lee's accusations. We discussed not only this work but Cameron Lee's conduct. He was **unsettled** by this manager's conduct and agreed it must stop. He also said from what you have said in addition to the BAC Standard that I do not think you violated this process. You see Cameron Lee was on vacation the week of August 2 – August 6. Nelson Akwari said we will talk to him immediately when he returns to work the next week. On the morning of August 3, Nelson Akwari told me in private that he made calls to Boeing Corporate Ethics after the meeting on August 2 and got information concerning the 'incidents'. He also said that he had notified Human Resources (HR) as well as the Boeing Corporate Ethics investigator at IRC on all of this.

P.3LLRPT10/18/21

With that, he reassured me they would talk to Cameron Lee when he returned to work from his vacation. Cameron Lee returned to work on August 11 and I spoke again to Nelson Akwari on that morning.

He said, "Lance we will speak to him this morning". With that, I left and did assigned work for that day. You see there was a Management Re-assignment on August 13. As I have stated, Cameron Lee was not my manager when I returned for Medical LOA on July 27, 2021. My manager was Andrew Housand at that time until August 12. The next day of July 13, Iliana Vasquez was my new manager. As a result, Cameron Lee was no longer working out of the clear glass cubicle at Crew Rest Fabrication as he had another assigned work desk elsewhere in the building.

Second: September 2, 2021 {Original date of September 2, 2021/Revised date of September 4, 2021 is the record copy}. Addendum Correction Change of September 7, 2021 applies as well. Its Case 897434: The number of pages was 9. It's titled Explanation Document for FAA Process Violation. This document explains the FAA/Boeing FAA Liaisons Audit on the morning of August 31, 2021 and its conclusion on the next morning of September 1, 2021. As the document outlines all of the details that occurred as well as the applicable BAC Standard, I firmly believe that I complied with the standard when performing this work. At the time of their departure on the morning of September 1, 2021, no one suggested I was not complying or told me to stop the work or ask me for additional information with regards to the performed work. In fact, they told me thanks for being an active participant with regards to answering all their questions, observing all the work, etc.

Third: September 27, 2021 {No assigned case number: The number of pages is 10} Addendum Additions of October 1, 2021. It's Titled Response Document for Boeing Corporate Ethics Investigations of September 23 and September 24, 2021. Cameron Lee is part of this document.

BOEING CORPORATE ETHICS INVESTIGATIONS OF SEPTEMBER 23 AND SEPTEMBER 24, 2021

Please know that the following is an excerpt of my Titled "Response Document for Boeing Corporate Ethics Investigations of September 23 and September 24, 2021." This document was generated and sent to Boeing Corporate Ethics on September 27, 2021. Cameron Lee is part of this document.

The start of the excerpts follow:

P.4LLRPT10/18/21

I was notified on September 13, 2021 by Melinda Vasquez that there was a scheduled WebEx Meeting for September 17, 2021 at 2:00 PM EST until 3:00 PM EEST. However, I received an email from her on September 17 at approximately 11:16 AM that due to an emergent issue that this meeting would have to be rescheduled. **Later, I received another email from her that this meeting was rescheduled for September 23, 2021 at 2:00 PM EST until 3:00 PM EST.**

So, on **September 23, 2021 at 2:00 PM EST this meeting started.** Unfortunately, there were technical difficulties to do it by WebEx so it was done by teleconference which is telephone.

They considered this: “Privileged Legal Communication – Limit Distribution to Those with a Need to Know. ...Also, please be advised that our investigation is subject to Attorney Client

Privilege so do not discuss this request with anyone”. **This meeting lasted until 4:00 PM EST.** Then we took a 30 minute break and determined that it was best to **start this meeting again at 8:00 AM EST the next day of September 24, 2021. We concluded this meeting at 10:35 AM EST on that day.** Again, this meeting was done by teleconference.

The investigators on September 23 were Sandra L. Martin who is a lead investigator and Michael H. Westphal who is an investigator in Charleston who works at 5400 Int'l. Blvd. The investigators on September 24 were Sandra L. Martin and Melinda Vasquez.

What surprised me were other revelations. They mentioned Boeing’s Legal Department was involved with both the Case number of 894916 as well as the current case of 897434. In addition, Boeing Corporate Ethics Charges were filed on me. **Know this: I have been suspended since the morning of September 2, 2021 but I did attempt to go to work on September 3, 2021 but I was not allowed on the property and my Boeing badge was confiscated. I contacted Nelson Akwari later that morning and explained this. He said Lance I tried to contact you yesterday but I was unable to get you. I did leave you a voicemail. I said that I was busy all day writing my “Explanation Document for FAA Process Violation”. I asked if I would be paid while I was out.** He said that I would be by the ETS (Employee Time Keeping System) with Suspended Operations as the activity. **THIS IS not the case. My ETS shows Absence without Pay. SO, I CAN NOT ACCESS MY BOEING EMAIL OR EMAILS AS I AM NOT ALLOWED ON THE PROPERTY. YOU SEE I WAS NEVER NOTIFIED THAT I HAD CHARGES FILED ON ME.** I asked the investigators who filed them. They are not allowed to tell me that. I BELIEVE Cameron Lee filed them as I do not know who else it could be. Or, he had someone else file them but of course that will never be stated but that person or persons would be an accessory. Of all things, it is alleged as misconduct. **LETS REMEMBER,**

P.5RPTLL10/18/21

Cameron Lee was not my manager when I got back from my Medical Leave of Absence (LOA) on July 27, 2021.

BUT YET, the investigators say that some of ‘these allegations’ occurred when I got back from LOA. As you recall. I was on LOA from June 14, 2021 through July 26, 2021 and returned to work on July 27, 2021. **LETS** also examine the fact that is ‘**Highly Suspicious**’ that allegations of misconduct would be filed after I have been suspended since a lot of time has gone by as well.

There are a lot of other concerns which were addressed by me which are equally ‘Highly Suspicious.’ This ends the excerpt.

BOEING INVESTIGATIVE STATEMENT AS A RESULT OF “BOEING CORPORATE INVESTIGATIONS OF SEPTEMBER 23 AND SEPTEMBER 24, 2021”

First: September 29, 2021. This concerned a QA Audit done on 6-8-21 before I went out on Medical (Leave of Absence). I returned back to work from Medical LOA on 7-27-21. Supposedly, other Boeing MTs were audited and contacted later as well. The Boeing Investigator’s Statement of September 28, 2021 was received and answered September 29, 2021. I was asked to read over the statement and make corrections where I felt were necessary. I did make corrections where they were needed. I was asked to agree that this revised statement was true and correct to the best of my knowledge. I did so.

OTHER CONCERNs

Please know that the following is an excerpt of my Titled “Response Document for Boeing Corporate Ethics Investigations of September 23 and September 24, 2021.” This document was generated and sent to Boeing Corporate Ethics on September 27, 2021. Cameron Lee is part of this document.

This is the start of the excerpt. I re-stated my points to the Boeing Investigators as out lined in my ‘Documents.’ I also stressed that if Cameron Lee made a suggestion or advisement to the Boeing FAA Liaison inspectors to audit me then he has not only violated the Boeing Code of Conduct but he has now violated federal law as this is retaliation. I also said that if he told another Boeing manager to suggest or make an advisement to the Boeing FAA Liaison inspectors to audit me it is still a federal violation with an accessory or accessories.
As you know, on page 9 in paragraph 4 of my “Explanation Document for FAA Process Violation” I have stated this concern.

P.6LLRPT10/18/21

I would like to think that the Boeing Investigators in ‘this meeting’ would not only note this concern but my other concerns as well for their ‘Summary Record’.

I also expressed that all of this “ACTIVITY” is not only “Highly Suspect” but I seriously believe that I have been **set-up to be victimized**. I mentioned to them again that my Boeing personnel folder does not have any such entries, allegations against me, negative statements, etc. that I am aware of. This was the case before I went to IRC on January 29, 2021 of this year.

In conclusion, I stated it would be hard to satisfactorily explain in a formal legal setting why I was audited on August 31 and September 1 2021 with an open Corporate Ethics Complaint of July 31, 2021 for the incident of July 30, 2021 with the case number of 894916. In addition, I have an open EEOC right-to-sue letter which I was given on July 20, 2021. I did say that Attorney Allan Holmes was advised of the right-to-sue letter but no legal action has been initiated and/or taken.

I volunteered this information as I was never asked about an attorney representing me nor was anything else mentioned by me or the investigators with regards to Allan Holmes or any other attorney. In addition, there is no production work at IRC since August 16, 2021. Of course, this ‘MEETING’ WAS SUPPOSEDLY ABOUT the Case of 894916 as well as the case of 897434 **BUT it was more than that. Like I have already said in this document, allegations have been filed on me since my suspension. I TOLD these investigators that I find all of this ‘ACTVITY’ Highly Suspicious and not normal as the timeline states. IT’S LIKE I was set-up to be victimized.**

Now let me say that these “newest allegations” may and/or will convolute or digress the main point of the cases of 894916 and/or 897434. The focus seems that I am now the suspect of any and all wrong doing based on the “latest and newest allegations”. The question is are the “newest allegations” meant to purposely derail the cases and/or stymie any and all of my serious allegations concerning this Manager. Or, is it an attempt by this Manager, who I reported in truthful reports to expose, to protect himself. Or, is it a combination of both. **This is the end of the excerpt.**

LEGAL CONCERNs

Let me start with the suspension. Please note that I have “no discipline entries in my personnel folder” that I aware of. You see when a formal disciplinary action occurs then the Boeing employee is notified. So, then the employee may file an Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR).

P.7LLRPT10/18/21

This Boeing Policy allows Boeing employees to file a case regarding an employment issue or issues so that they may be resolved. It is noteworthy that this includes disciplinary action taken on the employee. This must be filed timely or else it will not be considered.

I tried to get an answer as to why am I on a suspension when I have not been formally charged with a violation. When I say charged, I am talking about a document which states I have been charged with an infraction. On the morning of September 2, 2021, Nelson Akwari approached me at approximately 6:26 AM EST and told me I needed to accompany him to a conference room. Once in the conference room, I asked him if this was about the FAA/Boeing FAA Liaisons Audit which started the morning of August 31 which lasted all day and concluded on the morning of September 1, 2021. He said it was. He explained that both HR and Boeing Corporate Ethics advised him to talk to me that there is an investigation with regards to an alleged process violation. Supposedly, this violation occurred on the morning of September 1.

I gave him a copy of page 42 from BAC Section 8.6 which is the standard to do the work. I briefly explained all of the details involving the performed work. He listened intently and was concerned. He did suggest for me to generate documentation to assist with this serious issue.

He did say I was not allowed to do production work until the investigation was completed. This mentioned information is in my document. I did mention doing 5S work which is not production work. He did not give me a clear answer. But I did mention will I be paid while I am on this suspension. He did say that I would be. I asked what do I show in Employee Time Keeping System (ETS). He said show suspended operations. I then asked if I could show vacation time for today once I leave. He said you can. He then escorted me to my work station which I got my other pair of glasses, then to my locker where I got my raincoat, and to the ETS scanner where I scanned out. We then went outside the building and talked for a few minutes. I then drove off the property. At my residence, I showed .4 to meeting and 7.6 hours in ETS for September 2 which was Thursday.

You see he did not tell me that I would not be allowed back on the property the next day. I spent the entire day generating my document entitled "Explanation Document for FAA Process Violation". The morning of the next day I attempted to drive on the property at the security gate but I was stopped by the security guard and told I was not allowed on the property. The security guard told me to give her my Boeing Badge. I did. I turned my vehicle around and drove off the property. At my residence, I called Nelson Akwari and told him what had occurred. He said, "Lance I tried to call you yesterday afternoon but I was unable to get you but I did leave you a voicemail". I replied that I spent the entire day generating my document and it was submitted that evening. I also said I did not have my cell phone on that day.

But, I did reiterate my concern of being paid. Again, he said I would be paid the entire time I was out on this suspension until it was completed. I then said you told me yesterday that I will show suspended operations in ETS. He said this is correct. I then told him I appreciated his efforts and time. With that, the conversation ended. I did show 8.0 hours for suspended operations for Friday September 3. I also contacted Total Access for clarification that I was still a Boeing employee with active benefits. I was told by the Boeing representative that I was still active. I even contacted my Boeing Medical Insurance carrier who is Blue Cross/Blue Shield of Illinois.

P.8LLRPT10/18/21

They said my insurance was active. You see Total Access is the group you contact for information for any related topic with regards to your Boeing employment. I thought I was given accurate and reliable information by Nelson Akwari. But come Monday September 6, 2021, I discovered my ETS was turned-off. This means I cannot put ETS in to be paid. I immediately contacted Total Access and spoke to a representative in payroll. She did not have a valid explanation or reason why it was turned off. I then asked if I was still an active employee. She said I was. I was now very concerned. I even tried to contact Nelson Akwari but he was not available but I did leave a voicemail. I could get no answer from anyone. But it was turned back on the next day, but my ETS entries were changed. The entry of September 2 now showed .4 for meeting so it was the same but my entry for 7.6 hours vacation was changed to 7.6 hours of absence without pay. This is commonly called leave without pay (or, LWOP).

Nelson Akwari ended up contacting an HR Manager at 5400 Int'l. Blvd. who contacted me. She said this was a common policy for someone who was under an alleged FAA process violation. I told her I have been employed with Boeing for more than a few years but I have never heard of this. She reassured me that it was common. I emphatically said that the common practice is an employee is not in a suspended activity until formal charges have been initiated and then the suspension time was stated as well. Again, she reassured me that everything was fine and if cleared then I would be reimbursed for all this time. I then asked why did Nelson Akwari tell me otherwise. She said that he did not know the policy. I told her thanks for her efforts. BUT, I DO NOT SEE OR UNDERSTAND HOW THIS IS THE CASE. You see if I am terminated for this alleged violation then all of this time which is approaching 7 weeks means what??

So, as of now my ETS time which I was told not to edit is controlled by management and signed off as well. You see my annual and vacation time is still accruing but I am not being paid. Yes. I have active medical insurance but I am not being paid.

NOW LET ME MAKE MY LEGAL POINTS

I seriously believe that I am being legally victimized. You see Manager Cameron Lee has initiated and reported more alleged process violations even though he was not my manager when I returned from Medical LOA on July 27, 2021. As I have stated, for each so called alleged process violation I have addressed each and every one with "Documents". Those documents even explain the BCA Standards which I have complied with and as I have stated there has been no "Finding" at this time but yet his continuous barrage of alleged process violations has now led to this misguided and purposely prejudicial activity. I strongly believe that Boeing Corporate Ethics as well as Boeing Legal has not acted in a fair and impartial manner towards this now alleged FAA Process Violation. They have become convoluted and digressed from my "Complaints for Misconduct" with regards to this manager. In other words, they never effectively investigated my serious complaints. Instead, they have adopted and initiated an extensive investigation on my work standards and conduct. This new activity with its offered reasons is a pretext for retaliation.

As I have stated, this manager's conduct which I strongly believe has demonstrated retaliation and age discrimination. As you now know, my "Documents" go back to March 20, 2021.

P.9LLRPT10/18/21

The beginnings of this harassment and discrimination were reported time and time again. The question is why this manager's behavior was allowed to get to this point.

As you know, my internal harassment and discrimination ethics reports engaged me in protected activity from adverse actions but this is not the case. This protected activity is either reporting and/or participating in an EEO process. An employer must not retaliate against an individual for opposing a perceived EEO violation. I communicated my opposition to this manager's misconduct which is extreme. I seriously believe that no effective investigation was done by Boeing Corporate Ethics as they are not interested because of my age. I realize that because I have made complaints that I am not shielded from valid and pure consequences of misconduct or violations but I am shielded from 'findings' which are prejudicial and coupled with false assessments.

As of now, I strongly believe that my past and current allegations/concerns establish a connection between the protected activity or opposition and the now the adverse impact taken by this Employer. Please let me explain: I have been put on unpaid suspension since September 2, 2021 as I have already explained. As you know, I have not received a formal disciplinary action as based off PRO-1909. As I explained in the EEOC Document I provided you on May 23, 2021 with regards to EEOC Charge No. 415-2021-01047, "Boeing has been known to violate its own policy which may have detrimental effects for an employee who is having corrective action taken against them. This simply means the corrective action progressed to a termination with-out any other noted write-ups in the employee's personnel folder. In other words, one single write-up terminated an employee. Now this can occur if it is an extreme example like creating a hostile environment by acting violent at work". Or, intentionally damaging products by completely ignoring and/or deliberately not following work standards with no concern for the product. This means that there were no previous discipline entries and/or no intentional misconduct either with doing work or with regards to their behavior. But, the employee was terminated even though there were no extremities and there were no previous discipline actions in their personnel folder. PRO-1909 states that discipline will be handled under the concept of progressive corrective action.

You see I have no previous discipline entries in my personnel folder.

But, I strongly believe that I am now being subjected to a materially adverse action as I have been unofficially suspended with no paycheck for over 6 weeks. This employer action is based on retaliation.

I also firmly believe that these additional allegations with all other so called violations is a well orchestrated retaliation as well.

P.10LLRPT10/18/21

I have been a Boeing Employee since 9-21-21. As you know, I was with Mosley Technical Services as a contractor for Boeing from February 10, 2021 until September 20, 2021. I was offered a permanent position with Boeing which I accepted and its tenure started on September 21, 2021. As you know, I accepted a MT position at IRC and reported there on January 29, 2021.

I was never subjected at Boeing to this type of a hostile work environment and fostered “uninvited work environment” until I went to IRC. I had both QA Audits and/or FAA audits at Bldg. 88-19 located at 5400 Int’l Blvd. when I was a Composite MT but all were satisfactory.

CONCLUSIONS

I strongly believe I have been now subjected to not only harassment and discrimination but now materially adverse actions. The number one concern right now is this unpaid suspension. I firmly believe that this activity is not sanctioned or common as I have been told. I believe it no more than a policy of retaliation.

I also strongly believe that my engagement in protected activity resulted in this current materially adverse action. I also believe that my EEOC protected activity has been violated as well. You see my so called protected activity has been deliberately violated.

I also firmly believe that this manager’s past and current deliberate misconduct has tainted and misdirected all complaints made by me with the purpose of intensifying his overwhelming desire to have me terminated so he may gloat in private.

I seriously believe that Boeing has endorsed this unethical, pervasive, offensive, prejudicial, harassment, discrimination, illegal, and retaliation activity with no concern for my internal rights and/or federal rights. They say their purpose is to truly investigate with a fair and impartial manner but this so called investigation is a pretext for retaliation.

I firmly believe that my history of complaints with regards to all of this “malignant and vile virus activity” establishes not only harassment and discrimination but evidence of retaliation and age discrimination as I seriously believe that my age is a factor in persuading Boeing not too have done an effective and/or creditable investigation and/or investigations of all the reported complaints. Their negligence has increased this activity to where it’s at and where it will end.

I have spent a massive amount of time advising this company of a continuous misconduct demonstration which has only escalated to this point.

I did not want to place a Federal Lawsuit in federal court as I have waited to the last moment to exercise it as I believed that Boeing would stop this never ending malicious/toxic activity and exonerate me from further unwarranted harm but I now realize that it is more likely that this issue will result in me being terminated next with no serious consequences for the true instigator and no consequences as well as for the company who has endorsed all of this “vile” activity.

It does not matter to them about all of my good years of excellent production as well as my other related activities that benefitted this company. All of this is in my in site Boeing Profile.

P.11LLRPT10/18/21

There is a pattern that this manager has demonstrated with regards to me and I believe that all of my support documents establish this fact.

I also firmly believe that all of my strong worded and detailed documents have been easily discounted when they should have not been so easily discounted. They are strong circumstantial documents which carry a strong and relative significance. They reinforce a reckless pattern which I believe is a legal liability as they meet parts if not all of the definition of a materially adverse action which is evidence of retaliation.

The Boeing Organization has failed to both take the necessary proactive steps to stop this continuous negative activity with the additional negligence of letting it advance to this current state.

As I have stated before within this document, I did not want to initiate a Federal Lawsuit in the federal court system but I cannot trust nor be confidant that Boeing will handle this activity in a just and honest manner with regards to employment law.

I honestly believe that if I had not filed so much paperwork that I would have already been wrongfully terminated. I also firmly believe that this activity has spiraled out of control with regards to being handled in a fair and just legal manner and I still may be wrongfully terminated.

Sincerely,

Lance Lewis

V. Certification and Closing

Under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 11, by signing below, I certify to the best of my knowledge, information, and belief that this complaint: (1) is not being presented for an improper purpose, such as to harass, cause unnecessary delay, or needlessly increase the cost of litigation; (2) is supported by existing law or by a nonfrivolous argument for extending, modifying, or reversing existing law; (3) the factual contentions have evidentiary support or, if specifically so identified, will likely have evidentiary support after a reasonable opportunity for further investigation or discovery; and (4) the complaint otherwise complies with the requirements of Rule 11.

A. For Parties Without an Attorney

I agree to provide the Clerk's Office with any changes to my address where case-related papers may be served. I understand that my failure to keep a current address on file with the Clerk's Office may result in the dismissal of my case.

Date of signing: Oct. 18, 2021

Signature of Plaintiff



Printed Name of Plaintiff

Lance L. Lewis

B. For Attorneys

Date of signing: _____, 20__.

Signature of Attorney

Printed Name of Attorney

Bar Number

Name of Law Firm

Address

Telephone Number

E-mail Address
